



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,773	04/16/2004	Takahiro Mori	04233/HG	8734
1933	7590	07/01/2005	EXAMINER	
FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC 220 5TH AVE FL 16 NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708			NGUYEN, ANTHONY H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2854	

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

5 ✓

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/825,773	MORI, TAKAHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anthony H. Nguyen	2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/13/05 (2 pages)</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1- 4, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Pfeiffer et al. (US 5,447,102) in view of Kossak (US 3,735,702).

With respect to claims 1 and 6, Pfeiffer et al. teaches a printing process for a printing press having a plate cylinder 11, a blanket cylinder 16, a dampening roller 19 and an inking roller 13, the process comprising the steps of mounting the printing plate material (D) on the plate cylinder, carrying out printing by supplying dampening water and printing ink to the plate (Pfeiffer et al., Fig. 1A, 2 and col.9 lines 32-44), washing the surface of the blanket cylinder (Pfeiffer et al., col.10 lines 18-20), dismounting the printing plate and mounting the second printing plate, i.e., replacing the printing plate (Pfeiffer et al., col. 11, lines 13-16) and carrying out printing with the new plate (Pfeiffer et al., col. 11, lines 34-59). Pfeiffer et al. does not teach the step of drying the washed surface of the blanket cylinder. Kossak teaches the step of drying the washed surface cylinder 38 (Kossak, Fig. 1 and col.7 lines 9-13). In view of the teaching of Kossak, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the process of Pfeiffer et al. by providing the step of drying the blanket cylinder as taught by Kossak for quickly drying the surface of a blanket cylinder after cleaning. With respect to claims 2, 3 and 7,

Art Unit: 2854

the selection of the desired steps of (e) which is carried out between the steps (b) and (c) or during the steps (c) or (d) or the desired step of forming an image on the printing plate material between the steps (a) and (b) would be obvious through routine experimentation in order to get best possible print quality. With respect to claim 4, the use of dry cloth for wiping off the residual cleaning solution is well known in the art.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Pfeiffer et al. in view of Kossak as applied to claim 1-4, 6 and 7 above, and further in view of MacPhee et al. (US 4,757,763).

Pfeiffer et al. and Kossak teach all that is claimed, except the use of air on the surface of the blanket cylinder to eliminate the residual cleaning solution on the surface of the blanket cylinder. MacPhee et al. teaches the use of air which is directed on the surface of the blanket cylinder for drying the surface of the cylinder (MacPhee et al., the paragraph bridging cols. 7 and 8). In view of the teaching of MacPhee et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the steps of Pfeiffer et al. and Kossak by providing the step of drying the surface of the blanket cylinder using with air as taught by MacPhee et al. to improve the efficiency of cleaning the surface of a blanket cylinder.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Pfeiffer et al. in view of Kossak as applied to claim 1-4, 6 and 7 above, and further in view of Hebert (US 6,810,807).

Pfeiffer et al. and Kossak teach all that is claimed, except the use of laser for forming an image on the printing plate. Hebert teaches the use of laser for forming an image on the printing plate 16 (Hebert, Figs. 1 and 2 and col. 4 lines 27-38). In view of the teaching of Hebert, it would

Art Unit: 2854

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printing process of Pfeiffer et al. and Kossak by using laser for forming image formation as taught by Hebert for optimizing the print quality.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed on April 13, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive of any error in the above rejections.

Applicant argues that the Pfeiffer et al. do not teach the step of mounting of the printing plate material on the plate cylinder and the image formation layer having non-image portions being capable of being removed with dampening water and printing ink as recited in claim 1.

However, as explained above, Pfeiffer et al. and Kossak teach the step as recited. Obviously, the step of mounting the plate of Pfeiffer et al. and Kossak must included the plate material having the image formation layer including non-image portions to provide an operative printing press. Kossak teaches clearly the step of drying the surface of the cylinder being washed. Thus, the method as recited is **NOT** unobvious in the sense of 35 U.S.C. 103.

The Declaration, which includes the results shown in Table 7, is acknowledged.

Conclusion

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE

Art Unit: 2854

OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2169.

The examiner can normally be reached daily from 9 AM to 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld, can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Anthony Nguyen". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Anthony Nguyen
6/27/05
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800